

PUBLIC HEARING--July 14, 1965

Appeal #8284 Charles W. Colson, et ux, appellants.

The Zoning Administrator District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried with Mr. Davis and Mr. Scrivener dissenting, the following Order was entered on July 14, 1965:

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the rear and front yard and lot occupancy requirements of the R-4 District to permit conversion of existing garage into a dwelling and garage at rear of 105 - 6th Street, N.E., lot 812, square 867, be denied.

From the records and the evidence adduced at the hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

(1) A similar appeal was filed by this appellant at the May 1965 public hearing appeal #8172 and was denied by the Board on June 22, 1965. In this appeal appellant intended to connect the rear building with the front building to make it become one structure and utilize the garage building for a one bedroom dwelling unit with a garage. In the instant appeal appellant has removed the connecting porch and now files for variance from rear and front yard and lot occupancy requirements to permit conversion of the coadh house into a dwelling with a garage.

(2) Appellant's lot has a frontage of 30 feet on 6th Street and a depth of 101 feet to a 25 foot wide public alley which dead stops after extending 12 feet from the north at the rear of the lot. The lot contains an area of 3030 square feet of land.

(3) The existing building on the front of the lot is now used as a six unit apartment building. The rear garage building which is now vacant is a brick structure two stories in height.

(4) The rear building would have access to the street by a passage on the north side of the property which is ten feet three inches wide for most of its length and five feet ten inches wide for a distance of fourteen feet one inch.

(5) There was no objection to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing. The Capitol Hill Southeast Citizens Association and the Capitol Hill Restoration Society voted in favor of the granting of this appeal.

OPINION:

As in appeal #8172 denied on June 22, 1965, the Board finds that there is no grounds for the granting of a variance by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness or shape of the specific piece of property, or other extraordinary or exceptional situation or condition of the property. As stated in the previous appeal the existence of the carriage house is not, in our opinion, an extraordinary or exceptional situation which would justify a variance since there are numerous such carriage houses in the city. Therefore, the Board is of the opinion that the circumstances related to this property are sufficiently common that if the renovation of carriage houses for residential use is considered a desirable form of development, provisions for such development should become a part of the Zoning Regulations.